CERN-TH-2016-219
INR-TH-2016-038

Linearized supergravity with a dynamical preferred frame

Arthur Marakulin[1], Sergey Sibiryakov[1,2,3]

[1] *Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 60th October Anniversary Prospect, 7a, 117312 Moscow, Russia*

[2] *Theoretical Physics Department, CERN, CH-1211 Genève 23, Switzerland*

[3] *FSB/IPHYS/LPPC, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, CH-1015, Lausanne, Switzerland*

arXiv:1610.07805v1 [hep-th] 25 Oct 2016

Abstract

We study supersymmetric extension of the Einstein-aether gravitational model where local Lorentz invariance is broken down to the subgroup of spatial rotations by a vacuum expectation value of a timelike vector field. By restricting to the level of linear perturbations around Lorentz-violating vacuum and using the superfield formalism we construct the most general action invariant under the linearized supergravity transformations. We show that, unlike its non-supersymmetric counterpart, the model contains only a single free dimensionless parameter, besides the usual dimensionful gravitational coupling. This makes the model highly predictive. An analysis of the spectrum of physical excitations reveal superluminal velocity of gravitons. The latter property leads to the extension of the gravitational multiplet by additional fermionic and bosonic states with helicities $\pm 3/2$ and ± 1. We outline the observational constraints on the model following from its low-energy phenomenology.

1 Introduction

The possibility to modify the laws of gravity has been the subject of an intensive theoretical research during recent decades [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8], see [9] for review. This study has several motivations. First, it aims at solving the problems faced by the Einstein's theory of

general relativity (GR) at very short distances, where it loses the predictive power because of non-renormalizability, as well as at very long — cosmological — scales where the standard paradigm leads to the cosmological constant problem. Second, phenomenological models of modified gravity can be used as proxies in the analysis of experimental data to put constraints on deviations from GR at various scales within a consistent framework. The third motivation is a deeper theoretical understanding of the principles underlying GR and the consequences implied by relaxing or replacing some of these principles.

An interesting class of modified gravity models involves violation of the local Lorentz invariance. The possibility of such violation is often attributed to the effects of quantum gravity, see [10, 11] and references therein. In particular, it has been suggested by P. Hořava [12] that the quantum theory of gravity can be rendered perturbatively renormalizable by abandoning Lorentz invariance as a fundamental symmetry at high energies. The rigorous proof of renormalizability in a version of this proposal has been given recently in [13]. In this framework some amount of Lorentz symmetry breaking persists at all scales and at low energies the theory reduces to GR coupled to a scalar field with non-zero timelike gradient describing a preferred foliation of the spacetime [14].

Hořava gravity is closely related [15, 16] to the so-called Einstein-aether model [17, 18] where the effects of the dynamical preferred frame are encoded by a vector field u_m ("aether") constrained to have unit norm,[1]

$$u_m u^m = -1 \ . \tag{1}$$

In the formal language, this vector belongs to the coset $SO(3,1)/SO(3)$ of the Lorentz group over the group of spatial rotations around the direction of u_m that remain unbroken. This construction is similar to the sigma-model description of non-linearly realized simmetries in particle physics. The most general action for the aether interacting with gravity and containing up to two derivatives reads,

$$S = \frac{1}{2\varkappa^2}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\big[R - K^{mn}{}_{sr}\nabla_m u^s \nabla_n u^r + \lambda(u_m u^m + 1)\big] \ , \tag{2}$$

where λ is a Lagrange multiplier enforcing the constraint (1) and

$$K^{mn}{}_{sr} \equiv c_1 g^{mn}g_{sr} + c_2\delta^m_s\delta^n_r + c_3\delta^m_r\delta^n_s - c_4 u^m u^n g_{sr} \ . \tag{3}$$

The theory contains four dimensionless parameters c_i, $i = 1,2,3,4$. When the constraint (1) is solved explicitly and the action is written in terms of independent components of u_m,

[1] We use Latin letters from the middle of the alphabet for spacetime tensor indices; Latin letters from the beginning of the alphabet will be used for indices in the local Lorentz frame and Greek letters will be used for spinor indices. The signature of the metric is $(-,+,+,+)$.

it contains non-linear derivative self-interactions of these components. This restricts the domain of validity of the model to energies below $M_* \equiv \varkappa^{-1}\sqrt{c}$, where c is the characteristic value of the couplings c_i. At higher energies the model becomes strongly coupled and requires an ultraviolet (UV) completion. By analogy with sigma-models, the scale M_* can be identified with the scale of the Lorentz symmetry breaking[2], the product $(\varkappa M_*)^2 = c$ controlling the strength of Lorentz violating effects in gravity. Phenomenology of this model has been extensively studied resulting in constraints on the couplings c_i [19, 20, 18, 21, 22], see [23] for review. Recently, it was proposed to use Hořava gravity and Einstein-aether models for holographic description of strongly coupled non-relativistic systems [24, 25].

It has long been envisaged that an important role at high energies can be played by supersymmetry (SUSY). In particle physics SUSY is usually considered as an extension of the Poincaré group. However, as pointed out in [26], the SUSY algebra reduced by removing the boost generators closes on itself. In other words, SUSY does not necessarily require Lorentz invariance. Conversely, a general non-relativistic SUSY consisting of space- and time-translations, spatial rotations and supercharges in the spinor representation of $SO(3)$ is equivalent to the standard SUSY algebra without boosts [27]. Remarkably, SUSY enforces emergence of Lorentz symmetry at low energies in the Standard Model, even if the high-energy theory is not Lorentz invariant [26, 27]. This can explain the exquisite precision with which Lorentz invariance is satisfied in particle physics[3] [10, 28, 11].

It is natural to ask whether the local generalization of SUSY leading to the theory of supergravity (SUGRA) is also compatible with the existence of a preferred frame. Clearly, as in the case of ordinary gravity, this frame must be dynamical. The first step in answering this question was made in Ref. [27] which has constructed the supersymmetric extension of the aether model in flat spacetime. In the superspace formalism, the aether is promoted to a chiral vector superfield U^c,

$$\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} U^c = 0 \,, \tag{4}$$

where $\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}$ is the superspace covariant derivative[4]. The superfield obeys a constraint similar to (1),

$$U_c U^c = -1 \,, \tag{5}$$

[2]It is worth stressing that, unlike the case of the usual spontaneous symmetry breaking, Lorentz invariance need not be restored above M_*. On the contrary, violation of Lorentz invariance can become increasingly more important at high energies, as it happens in Hořava gravity.

[3]Soft breaking of SUSY with superpartner masses parametrically below the scale of Lorentz violation preserves the suppression of Lorentz-violating effects in the Standard Model [26, 27].

[4]We use the notations and conventions of [29] for the objects related to the spinor algebra and superspace geometry.

which forces it to develop a c-number vacuum expectation value (VEV) breaking the Lorentz symmetry. As a consequence, the latter is realized non-linearly on the perturbations around the vacuum. On the other hand, SUSY is unbroken by the VEV of U_c and remains linearly realized[5]. At the component level the theory describes a complex vector — complexified aether — and its superpartner — "aetherino".

Upon an eventual soft SUSY breaking aetherino and the imaginary part of the aether acquire masses, whereas the action for the real part reduces to the flat-spacetime limit of (2) with a special choice of the couplings c_i. It turns out that only the coupling c_1 can be chosen arbitrarily, whereas the coefficients in front of the other terms in the aether Lagrangian must satisfy,[6]

$$c_2 + c_3 = c_4 = 0 \, . \tag{6}$$

The analysis of [27] was insufficient to decide whether SUSY constrains the parameters c_2 and c_3 separately as in flat spacetime only their sum appears in the Lagrangian, the corresponding terms being different by a total derivative.

The purpose of the present paper is to couple the super-aether theory of [27] to SUGRA and analyze the uniqueness of this construction. We will work in the superfield formalism. The chirality constraint that we want to impose on the aether superfield forces us to use the non-minimal off-shell formulation of SUGRA [32, 33]. To see this, recall the general form of the anti-commutator of two spinor derivatives acting on a vector superfield [29],

$$\{\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot\alpha}, \bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot\beta}\} U^c = -T_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta}{}^b \mathcal{D}_b U^c - T_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta}{}^\gamma \mathcal{D}_\gamma U^c - T_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta}{}^{\dot\gamma} \bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot\gamma} U^c + U^b R_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta b}{}^c \, , \tag{7}$$

where $T_{AB}{}^C$ and $R_{ABC}{}^D$ are respectively torsion and curvature in the superspace[7]. In the minimal SUGRA all components of the torsion appearing in (7) vanish, whereas $R_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta bc}$ is in general non-zero [29]. This implies that the chirality constraint cannot be imposed in a covariant way as it is incompatible with (7). On the other hand, in the non-minimal formulation the supercovariant derivatives can be chosen such that [34, 35]

$$T_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta}{}^b = T_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta}{}^\gamma = R_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta b}{}^c = 0 \tag{8}$$

and therefore the covariant chirality constraint

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot\alpha} U^c = 0 \tag{9}$$

[5]This is different from the setup considered in the context of supersymmetric effective theory of inflation [30, 31] where not only the Lorentz group, but also SUSY is realized non-linearly.

[6]Soft SUSY breaking introduces corrections to these relations suppressed by the SUSY breaking scale.

[7]Capital Latin letters $A, B, \ldots$ are used for the general superspace indices.

is consistent with (7).

In this work we focus on coupling super-aether to SUGRA at the linearized level; the full non-linear case will be treated elsewhere [36]. Restriction to the linearized theory allows to use the familiar formalism of global superspace with the super-diffeomorphisms being encoded simply as a set of linear gauge transformations acting on the fields. This allows a transparent construction of the most general Lagrangian compatible with the desired symmetries.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we review the formalism of linearized non-minimal SUGRA. While most of the material in this section is standard, we present a somewhat detailed derivation of various relations that are used in the rest of the paper in order to keep the article self-contained. In Sec. 3 we introduce breaking of Lorentz invariance and the linearized aether superfield. We classify all inequivalent terms in the quadratic Lagrangian, derive their transformation laws under super-diffeomorphisms and find the most general invariant superfield action. In Sec. 4 we present the bosonic part of the action in components and discuss the physical implications of the model. Sec. 5 is devoted to conclusions. Appendices contain technical details.

2 Linearized non-minimal supergravity

2.1 Field content

We follow [37, 38]. The basic ingredient of the linearized SUGRA is a real vector superfield H_m transforming as[8]

$$\delta H_{\alpha\dot\alpha} = \bar D_{\dot\alpha} L_\alpha - D_\alpha \bar L_{\dot\alpha} \tag{10}$$

under the linearized super-diffeomorphisms parameterized by the spinor superfield L_α. To understand the physical content of H_m let us decompose it in components [39],

$$c_m = H_m\big| \,, \qquad \chi_{\alpha\beta\dot\beta} = D_\alpha H_{\beta\dot\beta}\big| \,, \qquad a_m = -\frac{1}{4} D^2 H_m\big| \,, \tag{11a}$$

$$e_{mn} = -\Delta_m H_n\big| \,, \qquad \psi^m_\alpha = \frac{i}{16}\bar\sigma^{m\dot\beta\beta}\bar D^2 D_\beta H_{\alpha\dot\beta}\big| \,, \qquad d_m = \frac{1}{32}\{D^2, \bar D^2\} H_m\big| \,, \tag{11b}$$

where the vertical line denotes evaluation at $\theta = \bar\theta = 0$, and

$$\Delta_m H_n \equiv \frac{1}{4}\bar\sigma^{\dot\alpha\alpha}_m [\bar D_{\dot\alpha}, D_\alpha] H_n \,. \tag{12}$$

[8] Throughout the text D_α, $\bar D_{\dot\alpha}$ denote the covariant derivatives of the flat superspace preserving the global SUSY. They should not be confused with the derivatives covariant under local SUSY transformations that are denoted by $\mathcal{D}_\alpha$, $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot\alpha}$.

We see that the multiplet contains a spin-2 field e_{mn} that is identified with the perturbation of the tetrad, as well as the spin-3/2 field ψ^m_α describing gravitino. Introducing also the components of the gauge parameter L_α,

$$\xi^m = i\bar\sigma^{m\dot\alpha\alpha}\bar D_{\dot\alpha}L_\alpha\big|\,, \qquad \varepsilon_\alpha = -\frac14\bar D^2 L_\alpha\big|\,, \qquad \zeta^m_\alpha = i\bar\sigma^{m\dot\beta\beta}D_\alpha\bar D_{\dot\beta}L_\beta\big|\,, \tag{13a}$$

$$\lambda_\alpha{}^\beta = -\frac14 D_\alpha\bar D^2 L^\beta\big|\,, \qquad \kappa^m = -\frac{i}{4}\sigma^m_{\alpha\dot\alpha}D^2\bar D^{\dot\alpha}L^\alpha\big|\,, \qquad \rho_\alpha = \frac{1}{16}D^2\bar D^2 L_\alpha\big|\,, \tag{13b}$$

one obtains from (10) the following transformation laws:

$$\delta c_m = -\operatorname{Im}\xi_m\,, \qquad \delta\chi_{\alpha\beta\dot\beta} = \frac{i}{2}\sigma_{m\beta\dot\beta}\zeta^m_\alpha + 2\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}\bar\varepsilon_{\dot\beta}\,, \qquad \delta a_m = \frac{i}{2}\kappa_m\,, \tag{14a}$$

$$\delta e_{mn} = \partial_m \operatorname{Re}\xi_n + (\sigma_{mn})^{\alpha\beta}\lambda_{\alpha\beta} - (\bar\sigma_{mn})^{\dot\alpha\dot\beta}\bar\lambda_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta} + \frac12\eta_{mn}(\lambda^\alpha{}_\alpha - \bar\lambda_{\dot\alpha}{}^{\dot\alpha})\,, \tag{14b}$$

$$\delta\psi^m_\alpha = \partial^m\varepsilon_\alpha - \frac{i}{2}\sigma^m_{\alpha\dot\beta}\bar\rho^{\dot\beta}\,, \qquad \delta d_m = -\frac12\Box\operatorname{Im}\xi_m + \Big[\frac{i}{4}(\sigma^n\bar\sigma_m)_{\alpha\gamma}\partial_n\lambda^{\alpha\gamma} + \text{h.c.}\Big]\,. \tag{14c}$$

It follows from (14a) that the imaginary part of ξ_m and the components ζ^m_α, κ_m can be chosen to impose the Wess–Zumino gauge,

$$c_m = \chi_{\alpha\beta\dot\beta} = a_m = 0\,. \tag{15}$$

The remaining transformations contain infinitesimal diffeomorphisms with the parameter $\operatorname{Re}\xi_m$, local Lorentz transformations parameterized by the symmetric part of $\lambda_{\alpha\beta}$ and local SUSY corresponding to ε_α. The trace part $\lambda^\alpha{}_\alpha$ and the spinor ρ_α give rise to extra symmetries: Weyl invariance and superconformal transformations. The latter symmetries are not generally present in SUGRA. They are removed by introducing a compensator.

In the minimal linearized SUGRA the compensator is chosen to be a chiral scalar superfield. However, as discussed in the Introduction, the minimal formulation does not admit a coupling to the super-aether theory. The next-to-simplest choice of the compensator, which leads to the non-minimal formulation, is a linear superfield Γ,

$$\bar D^2\Gamma = 0\,. \tag{16}$$

It transforms under the super-diffeomorphisms as

$$\delta\Gamma = -\frac{n+1}{4(3n+1)}\bar D^2 D^\alpha L_\alpha + \frac14\bar D^{\dot\alpha}D^2\bar L_{\dot\alpha}\,, \tag{17}$$

where $n \neq -\frac13, 0$ is a real parameter enumerating inequivalent versions of the non-minimal SUGRA. The transformation of the two lowest components of Γ,

$$\gamma = \Gamma\big|\,, \qquad \bar\omega_{\dot\alpha} = \bar D_{\dot\alpha}\Gamma\big|\,, \tag{18}$$

has the form,

$$\delta\gamma = \frac{n+1}{3n+1}\partial_m\xi_m - \frac{n+1}{3n+1}\lambda^{\alpha}{}_{\alpha} - \bar{\lambda}^{\dot{\alpha}}{}_{\dot{\alpha}} \,, \qquad \delta\bar{\omega}_{\dot{\alpha}} = 4\bar{\rho}_{\dot{\alpha}} \,. \tag{19}$$

Hence, they can be used to fix the Weyl and superconformal transformations by imposing the gauge,

$$\gamma = \frac{n+1}{3n+1}e^{m}{}_{m} \,, \qquad \bar{\omega}_{\dot{\alpha}} = 0 \,. \tag{20}$$

The action of the linearized non-minimal SUGRA reads [38],

$$S_{SG} = \frac{1}{\varkappa^2}\int d^4x d^4\theta \bigg[\frac{1}{4}\Big((\partial_k H_m)^2 - (\Delta_k H_m)^2\Big) + \frac{n+1}{2n}(\partial_m H^m)^2 + \frac{n+1}{2}(\Delta_m H^m)^2 \\ - i\frac{3n+1}{2n}\partial_m H^m\left(\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}\right) + \frac{3n+1}{2}\Delta_m H^m\left(\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma}\right) + \frac{9n^2-1}{8n}(\Gamma^2 + \bar{\Gamma}^2) + \frac{(3n+1)^2}{4n}\Gamma\bar{\Gamma}\bigg]. \tag{21}$$

It is straightforward to verify that it is invariant under the transformations (10), (17). The above expressions simplify considerably for the choice $n = -1$. However, we are not going to restrict to this case as we want to study the most general coupling of the super-aether to gravity.

2.2 Covariant derivatives and connections

In what follows we will need the form of the transformation of vector superfields under the superspace diffeomorphisms, as well as the expressions for the superspace connection. In principle, they can be obtained by linearizing the expressions given in [37, 38] for the general non-linear case. However, we prefer a different route and derive them directly within the linearized SUGRA. We start with the transformations of a general scalar superfield[9] [39],

$$\delta\Psi = -\frac{1}{4}(\bar{D}^2 L^{\alpha})D_{\alpha}\Psi - \frac{1}{4}(D^2\bar{L}_{\dot{\alpha}})\bar{D}^{\dot{\alpha}}\Psi + \frac{i}{2}(\bar{D}^{\dot{\alpha}}L^{\alpha} + D^{\alpha}\bar{L}^{\dot{\alpha}})\,\partial_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\Psi \equiv \hat{\mathcal{O}}\Psi \,, \tag{22}$$

where the last equality defines the action of the differential operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ on superfields. Covariant derivatives of Ψ must transform in the same way, up to a local Lorentz rotation,

$$\delta(\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}\Psi) = \hat{\mathcal{O}}\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}\Psi + (\mathcal{D}^{\beta}\Psi)\,M_{\beta\alpha} \,, \tag{23a}$$

$$\delta(\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}\Psi) = \hat{\mathcal{O}}\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}\Psi + (\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\beta}}\Psi)\,M^{\dot{\beta}}{}_{\dot{\alpha}} \,, \tag{23b}$$

$$\delta(\mathcal{D}_{a}\Psi) = \hat{\mathcal{O}}\mathcal{D}_{a}\Psi + (\mathcal{D}^{b}\Psi)\,M_{ba} \,, \tag{23c}$$

[9] We choose the representation of the super-diffeos that preserves real superfields.

where the rotation matrices $M_{\beta\alpha}$, $M_{\dot\beta\dot\alpha}$ and M_{ba} satisfy the structural relations of $SL(2)$,

$$M_{\alpha\beta} = M_{\beta\alpha} \ , \qquad M_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta} = -(M_{\alpha\beta})^* \ , \qquad M_{ab} = \frac{1}{2}\bar\sigma_a^{\dot\alpha\alpha}\bar\sigma_b^{\dot\beta\beta}(\epsilon_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta}M_{\alpha\beta} - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}M_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta}) \ . \tag{24}$$

By replacing the derivatives of Ψ in the formulas (23) with general superfields carrying spinor or vector indices we will obtain the transformations laws for the latter. We still need to find the expressions for the matrices $M_{\alpha\beta}$ etc. in terms of the gauge parameter L_α. To this end recall that the covariant derivative of a scalar is given by

$$\mathcal{D}_A\Psi = E_A{}^M\partial_M\Psi \ , \tag{25}$$

where A, M denote general — vector or spinor — indices and $E_A{}^M$ is the superspace vielbein. At linear order the latter can be written as,

$$E_A{}^M = e_A{}^M - I_A{}^B\, e_B{}^M \ , \tag{26}$$

where $e_A{}^M$ is the vielbein of the flat superspace and the tensor $I_A{}^B$ is linear in the SUGRA fields[10] H_b, Γ. Inserting (25) into (23a) we find

$$M_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{4}D_\alpha\bar D^2 L_\beta + \frac{1}{8}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}D_\gamma\bar D^2 L^\gamma \ . \tag{27}$$

Using the last relation in (24) we obtain the rotation matrix for Lorentz vectors,

$$M_{ab} = \frac{1}{4}(\sigma_{ab})_\beta{}^\alpha D_\alpha\bar D^2 L^\beta + \frac{1}{4}(\bar\sigma_{ab})^{\dot\alpha}{}_{\dot\beta}\bar D^{\dot\beta}D^2\bar L_{\dot\alpha} \ . \tag{28}$$

Equation (23a) determines also the transformation properties of the vielbein components $I_\alpha{}^\beta$, $I_{\alpha\dot\beta}$, $I_a{}^b$. The unique combinations of the fields H_b, Γ with these properties are,

$$I_\alpha{}^\beta = -\delta_\alpha^\beta\frac{1}{2}\bar\Gamma' \ , \qquad I_{\alpha\dot\beta} = 0 \ , \qquad I_\alpha{}^b = -iD_\alpha H^b \ , \tag{29}$$

where

$$\bar\Gamma' = -\frac{(3n+1)(n-1)}{4n}\,\bar\Gamma - \frac{(3n+1)(n+1)}{4n}\,\Gamma - \frac{(n+1)^2}{8n}\bar D^{\dot\alpha}D^\alpha H_{\alpha\dot\alpha} + \frac{n^2-1}{8n}D^\alpha\bar D^{\dot\alpha}H_{\alpha\dot\alpha} \ . \tag{30}$$

Thus, the spinor covariant derivative of a scalar field takes the form,

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha\Psi = \left(1 + \frac{\bar\Gamma'}{2}\right)D_\alpha\Psi + iD_\alpha H^b\partial_b\Psi \ . \tag{31}$$

[10] At the linearized level we do not distinguish the spacetime and Lorentz indices whenever it does not lead to confusion.

The expression for $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot\alpha}\Psi$ is obtained by complex conjugation.

For a superfield with spinor or vector indices the covariant derivatives should be supplemented with a connection term,

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha \Psi^B = \left(1+\frac{\bar\Gamma'}{2}\right) D_\alpha \Psi^B + iD_\alpha H^b \partial_b \Psi^B + (-1)^{|B|}\Psi^C \Phi_{\alpha C}{}^B \,, \tag{32a}$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot\alpha} \Psi^B = \left(1+\frac{\Gamma'}{2}\right) \bar{D}_{\dot\alpha} \Psi^B - i\bar{D}_{\dot\alpha} H^b \partial_b \Psi^B + (-1)^{|B|}\Psi^C \Phi_{\dot\alpha C}{}^B \,, \tag{32b}$$

where[11]

$$|B| = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for } \ B = b \\ 1, & \text{for } \ B = \beta \text{ or } \dot\beta \end{cases}$$

Requiring that the covariant derivatives transform in the appropriate representations of $SL(2)$ fixes the transformations of the connection components,

$$\delta\Phi_{\alpha C}{}^B = -D_\alpha M_C{}^B \,, \quad \delta\Phi_{\dot\alpha C}{}^B = -\bar{D}_{\dot\alpha} M_C{}^B \,. \tag{33}$$

However, these conditions are not sufficient to unambiguously determine the form of the connections in terms of the fields H_b, Γ: one has to also take into account the constraints on the superspace torsion imposed in the off-shell SUGRA formulation. This analysis is performed in Appendix A and yields the result,

$$\Phi_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = -\frac{1}{2}\big(\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} D_\gamma \bar\Gamma + \epsilon_{\alpha\gamma} D_\beta \bar\Gamma\big) \,, \tag{34a}$$

$$\Phi_{\dot\alpha\beta\gamma} = -\frac{1}{8}\big(\bar{D}^2 D_\beta H_{\gamma\dot\alpha} + \bar{D}^2 D_\gamma H_{\beta\dot\alpha}\big) \,. \tag{34b}$$

Note that these formulas do not depend on the parameter n. It is straightforward to check that they satisfy (33). The connection components for the conjugate spinors and vectors are obtained from (34) using the relations analogous to (24). In particular, we have

$$\Phi_{\dot\alpha bc} = -\frac{1}{4}(\sigma_{bc})_\alpha{}^\beta \bar{D}^2 D^\alpha H_{\beta\dot\alpha} - (\bar\sigma_{bc})^{\dot\beta}{}_{\dot\alpha} \bar{D}_{\dot\beta}\Gamma \,. \tag{35}$$

This expression will be used in the next section. Finally, we will not need the connections $\Phi_{aB}{}^C$ entering the covariant derivatives with vector indices, so we do not present their derivation.

[11] Following [29], we assume that the fields carrying even (odd) number of spinor indices take commuting (anti-commuting) values.

3 Breaking Lorentz invariance

3.1 Perturbations of super-aether

We now want to generalize the linearized SUGRA to the case when Lorentz invariance is broken down to the $SO(3)$ subgroup of spatial rotations by a vacuum expectation value (VEV) of a timelike vector field. To this end, we introduce [27] a chiral vector superfield U^a obeying the constraint (5). As a consequence of this constraint, the field develops a c-number VEV w^a satisfying the relations,

$$\mathrm{Re}\, w_a \,\mathrm{Re}\, w^a - \mathrm{Im}\, w_a \,\mathrm{Im}\, w^a = -1 \ , \qquad \mathrm{Re}\, w_a \,\mathrm{Im}\, w^a = 0 \ .$$

They imply that $\mathrm{Im}\, w^a$ is always spacelike and thus, unless $\mathrm{Im}\, w^a = 0$, the vacuum breaks both Lorentz and rotational symmetries. In this paper we are interested in quadratic theory around a rotationally invariant vacuum, so we focus on the case of real w^a. Then there is a preferred Lorentz frame where w^a has the form,

$$w^a = (1, 0, 0, 0) \ . \tag{36}$$

It is important to stress that, despite the breaking of Lorentz invariance, SUSY is preserved as it corresponds to translations in the superspace that leave the aether VEV invariant [26, 27].

Next, we expand the super-aether field about its VEV,

$$U^a = w^a + V^a \ . \tag{37}$$

The constraint (5) expanded to linear order translates into

$$w_a V^a = 0 \ , \tag{38}$$

whereas the chirality condition reads,

$$\bar{D}_{\dot\alpha} V^c = -w^b \Phi_{\dot\alpha b}{}^c \ . \tag{39}$$

Here we expanded the covariant derivative (32b) to linear order both in aether perturbations and SUGRA fields. Note that the explicit form of the connection (35) implies that it is chiral and hence the aether perturbation V^c is linear, $\bar{D}^2 V^c = 0$. Under local super-diffeomorphisms the aether perturbations transform non-linearly,

$$\delta V^a = w^b M_b{}^a \ , \tag{40}$$

where $M_b{}^a$ is the matrix of Lorentz rotations (28).

Our goal is to find the most general superfield action quadratic in the fields V^a, H_a, Γ and invariant under the transformations[12] (10), (17), (40).

3.2 Possible terms in the Lagrangian

First we notice that the only possible term in the superpotential is the term enforcing the constraint (38) by means of a chiral Lagrange multiplier Λ (cf. [27]),

$$\mathcal{L}_{constr} = \int d^2\theta\ \Lambda w_a V^a + \text{h.c.}\ . \tag{41}$$

The combination $w_a V^a$ is chiral due to the relation (39) and anti-symmetry of the connection coefficient $\Phi_{\dot\alpha bc}$ in the last two indices. No other chiral combination can be constructed from V^a and the SUGRA fields without using the spinor derivatives $\bar D_{\dot\alpha}$. On the other hand, the terms in the superpotential that involve $\bar D_{\dot\alpha}$ can be equivalently written as contributions to the Kähler potential. For example,

$$\int d^2\theta\, \bar D_{\dot\alpha}\Gamma \bar D^{\dot\alpha}\Gamma \simeq -2\int d^2\theta d^2\bar\theta\, \Gamma^2\ ,$$

and similarly for other contributions. Here the sign $\simeq$ means 'equal up to a total derivative'. Thus, it is enough to consider the Kähler potential only.

By analogy with (2), we search for the action in the form

$$S = \frac{1}{\varkappa^2}\int d^4x \int d^2\theta d^2\bar\theta\ \mathbb{L}\ ,$$

where the gravitational coupling has the mass dimension $[\varkappa^2] = -2$. All other parameters in the Lagrangian are assumed to be dimensionless. This implies that the superspace Lagrangian $\mathbb{L}$ must be constructed from terms with zero mass dimension. The dimensions of the object at our disposal are

$$[H_a] = -1\ , \quad [w^a] = [V^a] = [\Gamma] = 0\ , \quad [D_\alpha] = [\bar D_{\dot\alpha}] = 1/2\ , \quad [\partial_a] = [\Delta_a] = 1\ . \tag{42}$$

Once the aether VEV w^a is included as the spurion to compensate for the breaking of the Lorentz symmetry, the Lagrangian becomes a scalar with respect to global Lorentz

[12] It is worth noting that this action cannot be found simply by a linear gauging of the super-aether action of [27]. Such gauging would produce terms at most linear in SUGRA fields, whereas the presence of non-zero aether VEV w^a gives rise to new contributions quadratic in H_b and Γ, see below.

transformations. Besides, the Lagrangian must be real. We now proceed to the classification of possible terms in the quadratic Lagrangian.

Operators quadratic in V^a. We have a single operator in this class,

$$V_a \bar{V}^a \ . \tag{43}$$

The combination $V_a V^a$ and its complex conjugate can be rewritten purely in terms of the SUGRA fields H_a and Γ using the relation (39). Indeed,

$$\int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta}\ V_a V^a \simeq -\frac{1}{4}\int d^2\theta \bar{D}^2 (V_a V^a) = -\frac{1}{2}\int d^2\theta\ w^b w^c \Phi_{\dot{\alpha} b a} \Phi^{\dot{\alpha}\ a}_{\ c}\ .$$

As discussed above, the expression on the r.h.s. can be cast in the form of a contribution into the Kähler potential.

Operators linear in V^a. In total, there are four independent combinations,

$$w^a V^b \partial_a H_b\ , \quad w^a V^b \partial_b H_a\ , \quad w^a V^b \partial^c H^d \epsilon_{abcd}\ , \quad V^a D^2 H_a\ , \tag{44}$$

plus their complex conjugate. Here ϵ_{abcd} is the totally antisymmetric tensor in the four-dimensional spacetime. From all other terms the aether perturbation can be eliminated by performing integration by parts and using (39). For example,

$$V^a \bar{D}^2 H_a \simeq (\bar{D}^2 V^a) H_a = 0\ ,$$
$$w^a V^b \Delta_a H_b = w^a V^b \Big(-i\partial_a + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\sigma}_a^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha} \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} D_\alpha \Big) H_b \simeq -i w^a V^b \partial_a H_b + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\sigma}_a^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha} w^a w^c \Phi_{\dot{\alpha} c}{}^b D_\alpha H_b\ ,$$

and so on.

Operators without V^a. This is the most numerous group of terms, so it is convenient to further subdivide it according to the number of insertions of the spurion w^a. It is straightforward to see that the maximal number of insertions is 4. Thus, we have:

4 insertions of w^a. There is a single independent operator,

$$w^a w^b w^c w^d \partial_a H_b \partial_c H_d\ . \tag{45}$$

Two other possible operators would be

$$w^a w^b w^c w^d \partial_a H_b \Delta_c H_d \qquad w^a w^b w^c w^d \Delta_a H_b \Delta_c H_d\ .$$

However, the first of them is a total derivative, see Eq. (95a) in Appendix B.1, whereas the second is expressed in terms of (45) and contributions with fewer insertions of w^a due to the relation (95d).

3 insertions of w^a. This group is actually empty. The operators that can be written using three w^a-insertions are

$$w^a w^b w^c \partial_a H_b D^2 H_c \ , \qquad w^a w^b w^c \Delta_a H_b D^2 H_c$$

and their complex conjugate. However, they vanish upon integration over the superspace, see Eq. (95b).

2 insertions of w^a. There are in total 12 independent operators that we choose as follows,

$$w^a w^b \partial_a H_b \partial_c H^c \ , \qquad w^a w^b \partial_a H_c \partial_b H^c \ , \qquad w^a w^b \partial_c H_a \partial^c H_b \ , \tag{46a}$$

$$w^a w^b \Delta_a H_b \Delta_c H^c \ , \qquad w^a w^b \Delta_c H_a \Delta^c H_b \ , \tag{46b}$$

$$w^a w^b \partial_a H_b \Delta_c H^c \ , \qquad w^a w^b \partial_c H^c \Delta_a H_b \ , \tag{46c}$$

$$w^a w^b \epsilon_{acde} \partial^c H^d \Delta_b H^e \ , \tag{46d}$$

$$w^a w^b \partial_a H_b \Gamma \ , \qquad w^a w^b \partial_a H_b \bar{\Gamma} \ , \qquad w^a w^b \Delta_a H_b \Gamma \ , \qquad w^a w^b \Delta_a H_b \bar{\Gamma} \ . \tag{46e}$$

Other operators that can be written using two w^a insertions are

$$w^a w^b \Delta_a H_c \Delta_b H^c \ , \qquad w^a w^b \Delta_a H_c \Delta^c H_b \ , \tag{47a}$$

$$w^a w^b \partial_a H_c \Delta_b H^c \ , \qquad w^a w^b \partial_c H_a \Delta^c H_b \ , \qquad w^a w^b \epsilon_{acde} \partial_b H^c \partial^d H^e \ , \tag{47b}$$

$$w^a w^b \epsilon_{acde} \Delta_b H^c \Delta^d H^e \ , \qquad w^a w^b \epsilon_{acde} \Delta^c H_b \Delta^d H^e \ , \tag{47c}$$

$$w^a w^b \epsilon_{acde} \partial^c H_b \Delta^d H^e \ , \qquad w^a w^b \epsilon_{acde} \partial_b H^c \Delta^d H^e \ , \tag{47d}$$

$$w^a w^b D^2 H_a \bar{D}^2 H_b \ . \tag{47e}$$

Using the identities from Appendix B.1 one shows that the contributions of the latter operators into the Lagrangian are degenerate with the operators (46): for the two operators (47a) this is due to the relations (95e) and (95f); the terms (47b) vanish upon integration; the operators (47c) and (47d) are eliminated using (95g) — (95j); the operator (47e) is eliminated due to (95c).

1 insertion of w^a. There are 2 terms,

$$w^a \partial_b H^b D^2 H_a \ , \qquad w^a D^2 H_a \Gamma \ , \tag{48}$$

and their complex conjugate. One more operator

$$w^a \partial_a H_b D^2 H^b$$

is a total derivative, see (95b). Also, a replacement of the ordinary derivative ∂_a by Δ_a in the above operators does not generate new contributions due to the anti-chirality of the field $D^2 H_a$.

No insertions of w^a. 12 independent operators are,

$$(\partial_a H^a)^2 \ , \quad \partial_a H_b \partial^a H^b \ , \tag{49a}$$

$$(\Delta_a H^a)^2 \ , \quad \Delta_a H_b \Delta^a H^b \ , \tag{49b}$$

$$\partial_a H^a \Delta_b H^b \ , \tag{49c}$$

$$\partial_a H^a \Gamma \ , \quad \partial_a H^a \bar\Gamma \ , \quad \Delta_a H^a \Gamma \ , \quad \Delta_a H^a \bar\Gamma \ , \tag{49d}$$

$$\Gamma^2 \ , \quad \bar\Gamma^2 \ , \quad \Gamma\bar\Gamma \ . \tag{49e}$$

The five remaining combinations,

$$\partial_a H_b \Delta^a H^b \ , \quad D^2 H_a \bar D^2 H^a \ , \quad \Delta_a H_b \Delta^b H^a \ , \quad \epsilon_{abcd} \Delta^a H^b \Delta^c H^d \ , \quad \epsilon_{abcd} \partial^a H^b \Delta^c H^d \ , \tag{50}$$

produce degenerate contributions into the action, as it follows from Eqs. (95a), (95c), (95f), (95g), (95i).

3.3 The invariant action

The action for linearized SUGRA with broken Lorentz invariance is obtained as a linear combination of the independent operators listed in the previous subsection that is invariant under the gauge transformations (10), (17), (40). To find this combination, let us analyze the variations of individual operators. We start with the term quadratic in the aether perturbations,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\left(V_a \bar V^a\right) =& w^b M_{ba} \bar V^a + w^b M_{ba} V^a \\
\simeq& - w^b w^c L^\beta (\sigma_{ba})_\beta{}^\gamma \left(\frac{1}{4} \bar D^2 \Phi_{\gamma c}{}^a + i \partial_{\gamma\dot\gamma} \Phi^{\dot\gamma}{}_c{}^a \right) + \text{h.c.} \\
=& L^\beta \bigg(- \frac{i}{2} w^a w^b (\sigma_{ak})_\beta{}^\gamma \bar D^2 D_\gamma \partial^k H_b + \frac{i}{4} w^a w^b \bar D^2 D_\beta \partial_a H_b - \frac{i}{8} \bar D^2 D_\beta \partial_k H^k \\
& - i w^a w^b \sigma_{a\beta\dot\beta} \bar D^{\dot\beta} \partial_b \Gamma - \frac{i}{4} \sigma_{k\beta\dot\beta} \bar D^{\dot\beta} \partial^k \Gamma - \frac{3}{16} \bar D^2 D_\beta \bar\Gamma \bigg) + \text{h.c.} \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where in the second line we used the chirality condition (39). One observes that this variation is independent of V^a and is expressed exclusively in terms of the SUGRA fields H_b and Γ. Besides, it is at most quadratic in the spurion w^a. On the other hand, the variations of the operators (44) contain contributions linear in V^a,

$$\delta(w^a V^b \partial_a H_b) \ni - \frac{1}{2} \bar L_{\dot\beta} \bar\sigma_b^{\dot\beta\beta} w^a D_\beta \partial_a V^b \ , \tag{52a}$$

$$\delta(w^a V^b \partial_b H_a) \ni - \frac{1}{2} \bar L_{\dot\beta} \bar\sigma_a^{\dot\beta\beta} w^a D_\beta \partial_b V^b \ , \tag{52b}$$

$$\delta(w^a V^b \partial^c H^d \epsilon_{abcd}) \ni -\frac{1}{2}\bar{L}_{\dot\beta}\bar\sigma^{d\,\dot\beta\beta} w^a D_\beta \partial^c V^b \epsilon_{dacb} \,, \tag{52c}$$

$$\delta(V^a D^2 H_a) \ni L_\beta \big[-4i(\sigma_{ka})_\gamma{}^\beta D^\gamma \partial^k V^a + 2i D^\beta \partial_a V^a \big] \,. \tag{52d}$$

It is straightforward to see that these cannot be canceled among themselves or against variations of any other operators in the Lagrangian. Thus, we conclude that the operators (44) do not appear in the invariant action. Next, the variation of the operator (45) reads,

$$\delta(w^a w^b w^c w^d \partial_a H_b \partial_c H_d) \simeq L_\beta w^a w^b w^c w^d \bar\sigma_a^{\dot\beta\beta} \bar D_{\dot\beta} \partial_b \partial_c H_d + \text{h.c.} \,, \tag{53}$$

and manifestly contains four insertions of w^a. There are no other operators whose variation would have this property and therefore (45) is also absent from the invariant action.

To proceed, we notice that the remaining operators split into several sectors which do not mix under the linearized super-diffeomorphisms. These sectors are characterized by the properties of the operators under the action of the R-symmetry and CP. The R-symmetry rotates the phases of the spinor derivatives,

$$D_\alpha \mapsto \mathrm{e}^{-i\varphi} D_\alpha \,, \qquad \bar D_{\dot\alpha} \mapsto \mathrm{e}^{i\varphi} \bar D_{\dot\alpha} \,, \tag{54}$$

with the superfields H_a, Γ, V^a and the ordinary derivatives ∂_a kept intact. Correspondingly, the operators (46), (49) have zero R-charge, whereas the R-charge of the operators (48) is -2. The R-charge is preserved by the super-diffeos, provided one assigns $R = -1$ to the gauge parameter L_β. This implies that if the operators (48) entered into the invariant action, their variations would have to cancel with each other. However, it is straightforward to see that this is impossible. We omit the operators (48) in what follows.

Next we turn to the properties of the operators under parity. Pure parity does not preserve the SUSY algebra and thus cannot be defined on the superspace. To be compatible with SUSY, parity must be supplemented by the charge conjugation [37]. In the Lorentz frame where the spatial components of the aether VEV vanish, see (36), the CP transformations have the form[13],

$$V_i \mapsto -\bar V_i \tag{55a}$$

$$H_0 \mapsto -H_0 \,, \qquad H_i \mapsto H_i \,, \qquad \Gamma \mapsto \bar\Gamma \tag{55b}$$

$$\partial_0 \mapsto \partial_0 \,, \qquad \partial_i \mapsto -\partial_i \,, \tag{55c}$$

$$\Delta_0 \mapsto -\Delta_0 \,, \qquad \Delta_i \mapsto \Delta_i \,, \tag{55d}$$

[13]Note that in this frame $V_0 = 0$ due to the constraint (38).

where $i = 1, 2, 3$ denote the spatial indices. Notice that $(V_a + \bar{V}_a)$, ∂_a transform as vectors, whereas $(V_a - \bar{V}_a)$, H_a, Δ_a are pseudo-vectors. Clearly, the SUGRA action (21) is CP-even. It is convenient to choose the basis of operators having definite CP quantum numbers. Out of (46), (49) we construct the following combinations:

CP-even:

$$w^a w^b \partial_a H_b \partial_c H^c \ , \quad w^a w^b \partial_a H_c \partial_b H^c \ , \quad w^a w^b \partial_c H_a \partial^c H_b \ , \tag{56a}$$

$$w^a w^b \Delta_a H_b \Delta_c H^c \ , \quad w^a w^b \Delta_c H_a \Delta^c H_b \ , \quad w^a w^b \epsilon_{acde} \partial^c H^d \Delta_b H^e \ , \tag{56b}$$

$$i w^a w^b \partial_a H_b (\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}) \ , \quad w^a w^b \Delta_a H_b (\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma}) \ , \tag{56c}$$

$$(\partial_a H^a)^2 \ , \quad \partial_a H_b \partial^a H^b \ , \quad (\Delta_a H^a)^2 \ , \quad \Delta_a H_b \Delta^a H^b \ , \tag{56d}$$

$$i \partial_a H^a (\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}) \ , \quad \Delta_a H^a (\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma}) \ , \quad \Gamma^2 + \bar{\Gamma}^2 \ , \quad \Gamma \bar{\Gamma} \ ; \tag{56e}$$

CP-odd:

$$w^a w^b \partial_a H_b \Delta_c H^c \ , \quad w^a w^b \Delta_a H_b \partial_c H^c \ , \tag{57a}$$

$$w^a w^b \partial_a H_b (\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma}) \ , \quad i w^a w^b \Delta_a H_b (\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}) \ , \tag{57b}$$

$$\partial_a H^a \Delta_b H^b \ , \quad \partial_a H^a (\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma}) \ , \quad i \Delta_a H^a (\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}) \ , \quad i(\Gamma^2 - \bar{\Gamma}^2) \ . \tag{57c}$$

To the first group one has to add the CP-even operator (43). The gauge variations of operators should cancel separately within each group.

The transformations of the operators (56), (57) are given in Appendix B.2. For the CP-even sector the condition that the variations cancel leads to a system of 17 linear equations for 17 unknowns — coefficients in front of the operator (43) and 16 operators (56). This system is degenerate and has a general solution with two free parameters. One of them is just the usual gravitational coupling $\varkappa^2$ and one recovers the SUGRA action (21) as part of the general solution. The second free parameter can be chosen as the coefficient in front of the operator (43) and the corresponding contribution into the action reads,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{Æ} = \frac{C}{2\varkappa^2} \int d^4x d^4\theta \Big[& V_a \bar{V}^a + i w^a w^b \partial_a H_b (\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}) + w^a w^b \Delta_a H_b (\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma}) \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \big(\Delta_k H_m \Delta^k H^m - \partial_k H_m \partial^k H^m - (\Delta_m H^m)^2 + (\partial_m H^m)^2 \big) \\ & + \frac{i}{4} \partial_m H^m (\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}) + \frac{1}{4} \Delta_m H^m (\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma}) + \frac{3}{8} (\Gamma^2 + \bar{\Gamma}^2) \Big] \ , \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

where C is a dimensionless coupling. Curiously, this part of the action does not depend on the choice of the parameter n labeling the off-shell realizations of the non-minimal SUGRA.

Finally, the requirement of vanishing gauge variation in the CP-odd sector leads to a system of 13 equations for only 8 unknowns which has only a trivial solution (see Appendix B.2).

We conclude that (58) combined with (21) gives the most general action for supersymmetric aether coupled to non-minimal linearized SUGRA with linear compensator.

4 Physical implications

4.1 Bosonic Lagrangian

To understand the physical consequences of the action (58), we compute the corresponding Lagrangian in components. We restrict to the bosonic part.

The components of the SUGRA field H_m have been introduced in (11); we impose the Wess–Zumino gauge (15). We further use the local Lorentz transformations to make the tetrad symmetric,

$$e_{mn} = e_{nm} = \frac{1}{2} h_{mn} \ , \tag{59}$$

where h_{mn} are the perturbations of the metric. Due to the relation (20) fixing the Weyl invariance, the lowest component of Γ is not independent,

$$\Gamma\big| = \frac{n+1}{2(3n+1)}\, h \ , \qquad h \equiv h^m{}_m \ . \tag{60}$$

The independent bosonic components of Γ and of the super-aether multiplet are denoted as follows,

$$q_m \equiv q_m^R + i q_m^I = \Delta_m \Gamma\big| \ , \qquad B = -\frac{1}{4} D^2 \Gamma\big| \ , \tag{61}$$

$$v^a \equiv v^{R,a} + i v^{I,a} = V^a\big| \ , \qquad G^a = -\frac{1}{4} D^2 V^a\big| \ . \tag{62}$$

Using the general formula

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{32} \{\bar{D}^2, D^2\}\, \mathbb{L}\big| \tag{63}$$

relating the component Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ to that in superfields we obtain after a somewhat

tedious, but straightforward calculation,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{Æ} = \frac{C}{2\varkappa^2}\Big\{ & -\partial_m v^a \partial_m \bar{v}^a + G^a \bar{G}^a \\ & + v^{R,a} w^b \Big(-2\epsilon_{abkm}\partial_k d_m - \frac{1}{2}\partial_a\partial_k h_{kb} + \frac{1}{2}\partial_b\partial_k h_{ka} + \partial_b q^I_a - \partial_a q^I_b + \epsilon_{abkm}\partial_k q^R_m \Big) \\ & + v^{I,a} w^b \Big(2\partial_a d_b - 2\partial_b d_a - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{abkm}\partial_k\partial_l h_{lm} - \partial_b q^R_a + \partial_a q^R_b + \epsilon_{abkm}\partial_k q^I_m \Big) \\ & - \frac{1}{8}\mathbb{D}_{ca}\bar{\mathbb{D}}_{ca} + \frac{n+1}{4(3n+1)} w^a w^b \big(h_{ab}\Box h - h\partial_a\partial_k h_{kb} \big) + \frac{1}{2} w^a w^b q^I_m \big(\partial_m h_{ab} - \partial_a h_{mb} \big) \\ & + 2 w^a w^b d_b q^R_a + \frac{1}{2} w^a w^b h_{nb}\epsilon_{nakm}\partial_k q^R_m - \frac{3}{2} d_m d_m - \frac{1}{8} h_{km}\Box h_{km} - \frac{5}{32}\partial_k h_{km}\partial_l h_{lm} \\ & - \frac{2n+1}{8(3n+1)} h\partial_k\partial_l h_{kl} + \frac{n(3n+2)}{8(3n+1)^2} h\Box h - \frac{1}{8} q^I_m \partial_k h_{km} - \frac{1}{4(3n+1)} q^I_m \partial_m h \\ & + \frac{3}{8} q^I_m q^I_m - \frac{3}{8} q^R_m q^R_m + \frac{1}{2} d_k q^R_k \Big\} \,, \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{D}_{ca} = & - w_c \Big[q_a + 2d_a - \frac{i}{2}\partial_k h_{ka} + i\frac{n}{3n+1}\partial_a h \Big] \\ & + \eta_{ac} w^b \Big[q_b + 2d_b - \frac{i}{2}\partial_k h_{kb} + i\frac{n}{3n+1}\partial_b h \Big] \\ & + w^b \epsilon_{bmac} \Big[i q_m - 2i d_m + \frac{1}{2}\partial_k h_{km} - \frac{n}{3n+1}\partial_m h \Big] \\ & - i w^b \partial_b h_{ac} + i w^b \partial_a h_{cb} + w^b \epsilon_{bcmn}\partial_m h_{na} - w^b \epsilon_{mnac}\partial_m h_{nb} \,. \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

To this must be added the standard supergravity Lagrangian following from (21),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{SG} = \frac{1}{2\varkappa^2}\Big\{ & \frac{1}{4} h_{km}\Box h_{km} + \frac{n-1}{8n}\partial_k h_{km}\partial_l h_{lm} - \frac{n+1}{4(3n+1)} h\Box h \\ & + \frac{3n+1}{2n} q^I_m \partial_k h_{km} - q^I_m \partial_m h - \frac{3n+1}{2n} q^I_m q^I_m \\ & - 2(n-1) d_m d_m + 2(3n+1) d_m q^R_m - \frac{3(3n+1)}{2} q^R_m q^R_m + \frac{(3n+1)^2}{2n} B\,\bar{B} \Big\} \,. \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

Note that the parameter C multiplies the kinetic term for the aether perturbations in (64) and hence must be positive to ensure the positivity of the kinetic energy.

The next step is to integrate out the auxiliary fields. Clearly, the fields B, G^a simply vanish on the equations of motion. On the other hand, the fields d_m, q_m take non-trivial

values. The result of integrating them out in the general case is rather cumbersome and not illuminating. For the sake of clarity, we will perform an explicit calculation under the assumption $C \ll 1$. To properly capture the mixing between the aether and gravity in the first non-trivial order in C, we canonically normalize the aether perturbations so that their leading kinetic term becomes of order 1,

$$v_a^{R,I} \mapsto \hat{v}_a^{R,I} = \sqrt{C}\, v_a^{R,I} \ .$$

Then we keep the contributions to the Lagrangian through order $O(C)$. To this end, it is sufficient to find the auxiliary fields through order $O(\sqrt{C})$,

$$d_m = \sqrt{C}\left[\frac{1}{2} w_m \partial_a \hat{v}^{I,a} - \frac{1}{2} w^a \partial_a \hat{v}^I_m - \frac{1}{4} w^b \epsilon_{bkam} \partial^k \hat{v}^{R,a}\right] + O(C) \ , \tag{67a}$$

$$q^R_m = \sqrt{C}\left[\frac{n}{3n+1} w_m \partial_a \hat{v}^{I,a} - \frac{n}{3n+1} w^a \partial_a \hat{v}^I_m - \frac{n+1}{2(3n+1)} w^b \epsilon_{bkam} \partial^k \hat{v}^{R,a}\right] + O(C) \ , \tag{67b}$$

$$q^I_m = \frac{1}{2}\partial^k h_{km} - \frac{n}{3n+1}\partial_m h + \frac{\sqrt{C} n}{3n+1}\left[w_m \partial_a \hat{v}^{R,a} - w^b \partial_b \hat{v}^R_m - w^b \epsilon_{bkam} \partial^k \hat{v}^{I,a}\right] + O(C) \ . \tag{67c}$$

Substituting this back into (64), (66) we arrive at[14],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{SG} + \mathcal{L}_{Æ} = \frac{1}{2\varkappa^2}\Big\{ & \frac{1}{4} h_{km} \Box h^{km} + \frac{1}{2}\partial^k h_{km} \partial_l h^{lm} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_k h^{km} \partial_m h + \frac{1}{4}\partial_m h \partial^m h \\ & - \partial_m \hat{v}^R_a \partial^m \hat{v}^{R,a} - \partial_m \hat{v}^I_a \partial^m \hat{v}^{I,a} + \sqrt{C}\, \hat{v}^{R,a} w^b \big(\partial_b \partial^k h_{ka} - \partial_a \partial^k h_{kb}\big) \\ & - \frac{C}{4} w^a w^b \big(\partial_a h_{mn} - \partial_m h_{na}\big)\big(\partial_b h^{mn} - \partial^m h^n{}_b\big) - \frac{C}{2} w^a w^b \partial_a \hat{v}^{I,m} \partial_b \hat{v}^I_m \\ & + \frac{C}{2}(\partial_a \hat{v}^{I,a})^2 - C w^b w^c \epsilon_{bkam} \partial^k \hat{v}^{R,a} \partial_c \hat{v}^{I,m} + O(C^{3/2}) \Big\} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

One notices that the parameter n has dropped from the Lagrangian and, apart from the usual gravitational coupling, the theory is described by a single dimensionless constant C. When restricted to the case of real aether, $\hat{v}^I_a = 0$, the Lagrangian (68) coincides with the quadratic part of the Einstein-aether Lagrangian (2) for the choice of couplings[15]

$$c_1 = C \ , \qquad c_2 = c_3 = c_4 = 0 \ . \tag{69}$$

[14] In deriving this expression one makes a further rescaling of the fields,

$$\left(1 + \frac{C\, n}{4(3n+1)}\right) \hat{v}^R_a \mapsto \hat{v}^R_a \ , \qquad \left(1 - \frac{C\, n}{4(3n+1)}\right) \hat{v}^I_a \mapsto \hat{v}^I_a \ .$$

[15] In this comparison one should recall that v^a stands for the perturbation of the aether field in the *tetrad basis*. It is related to the perturbation in the tangent space by $\delta u^m = v^m - \frac{1}{2} h^{ma} w_a$.

Thus we conclude that SUSY reduces the number of free parameters in the Einstein-aether model from four down to one.

4.2 Spectrum of excitations and observational constraints

Let us discuss the spectrum of modes described by the Lagrangian (68). We will work in the frame where the VEV w^a is purely timelike as given by (36), so that the rotational symmetry is preserved. As the Lagrangian is quadratic both in space- and time-derivatives, all modes have linear dispersion relations,

$$E = s \cdot p \,, \tag{70}$$

where E and p are the energy and the absolute value of the mode's momentum. Due to invariance with respect to spatial rotations, the modes are also characterized, as in the familiar Lorentz invariant case, by the projection of the angular momentum on the direction of motion, i.e. helicity. The maximal helicity present in the spectrum is 2, which corresponds to the transverse-traceless excitations of the metric — gravitons. It is straightforward to see from (68) that the corresponding velocity is (cf. [40]),

$$s^2_{h=2} = \frac{1}{1-C} \approx 1 + C \,, \tag{71}$$

which differs from 1 whenever Lorentz invariance is broken ($C \neq 0$). This is in contrast with the situation for chiral and gauge SUSY multiplets which, under broad assumptions, retain unit propagation velocity even in the presence of Lorentz symmetry breaking [26].

The deviation of the graviton velocity from one has interesting consequences for the structure of the gravitational supermultiplet. Indeed, consider the representation of the SUSY algebra corresponding to the dispersion relation of the form (70). Following the standard procedure [29] one rotates the direction of the particle momentum to align with the third axis. With this choice, the anticommutators of the supercharges take the form,

$$\{Q_\alpha, \bar{Q}_{\dot\beta}\} = 2E \begin{pmatrix} 1 + s^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - s^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{72}$$

Note that unitarity requires the anticommutator of two conjugate operators to be non-negative. Comparing with (72) we conclude that in supersymmetric theories the velocity of particles is always greater or equal to one, $s \geq 1$. If $s = 1$, as it happens, in particular, in the standard Lorentz invariant case, the lower right element in the above matrix is zero implying that one pair of the supercharges vanish identically, $Q_2 = \bar{Q}_{\dot 2} = 0$. The other pair of the supercharges Q_1, $\bar{Q}_{\dot 1}$ describes fermionic annihilation and creation operators. Thus,

starting from the state with the lowest helicity h, annihilated by Q_1, one can create a single state with helicity $(h+1/2)$ by applying $\bar{Q}_{\dot{1}}$. As a consequence, in the Lorentz invariant case the gravitational multiplet consists of just two states with helicities $h=-2$ (graviton) and $h=-3/2$ (gravitino)[16]. However, whenever $s>1$, the anticommutator of Q_2 and $\bar{Q}_{\dot{2}}$ does not vanish and they form an independent pair of creation-annihilation operators. It implies that the multiplet must contain two additional states: one with $h=-3/2$ and another with $h=-1$. In other words, the gravitational multiplet gets enhanced.

In the model of this paper the additional states come from the aether superfield. Indeed, its fermionic component defined as

$$\eta^m_\alpha = D_\alpha V^m\big| \tag{73}$$

carries both a spinor and a vector index and decomposes into a pair of $h=\pm 3/2$ states and two pairs of $h=\pm 1/2$ states. The above reasoning implies that the first pair is absorbed by the graviton multiplet. The aether itself, represented by $\hat{v}^{R,I}_m$, contains two pairs of $h=\pm 1$ states and a pair of $h=0$ states. One of the $h=\pm 1$ pairs must join the graviton multiplet. To check this we compute the velocities of the helicity 1 modes in Appendix C. We find, as expected, that for two modes the velocities coincide with that of gravitons (71),

$$s^2_{h=1,(1)} = 1 + C\ . \tag{74}$$

We identify these modes as belonging to the graviton multiplet. On the other hand, the remaining pair of $h=\pm 1$ states have unit velocities[17],

$$s^2_{h=1,(2)} = 1\ . \tag{75}$$

Finally, a straightforward analysis of the Lagrangian (68) shows that the helicity 0 modes also have unit velocities. Thus, apart from the graviton multiplet, the theory contains 4 bosonic degrees of freedom propagating with unit velocity that match the two pairs of $h=\pm 1/2$ fermionic states contained in η^m_α. Though an explicit study of the fermionic sector is beyond the scope of this paper, one concludes from the above reasoning that the velocities of the $h=\pm 1/2$ states must be equal to one.

From the phenomenological perspective, the excess of the graviton velocity over the speed of light, which is equal to unity once the Standard Model fields are included in the framework, provides a firm prediction of the model and can be used to probe the value of the parameter C. A future observation of the gravitational wave signal in coincidence with

[16]The states with opposite helicities $+2$, $+3/2$ appear upon the CPT conjugation.

[17]Up to possible corrections of order $O(C^2)$ that we neglect in our analysis.

an electromagnetic counterpart will constrain C to be as low as 10^{-17} if the source happens to be at a cosmological distance, cf. [41]. On the other hand, the current direct upper limit on the gravitational wave velocity [42] is much milder[18] and allows the values of C all the way up to $C \lesssim 1$.

The strongest constraints on the model at present come from the tests of general relativity within the Solar System and from the observations of solitary pulsars. The Solar System tests place bounds on the values of the post-Newtonian parameters α_1, α_2 describing deviations from Lorentz invariance [44],

$$|\alpha_1| \lesssim 10^{-4} \ , \qquad |\alpha_2| \lesssim 10^{-7} \ . \tag{76}$$

To apply these bounds to our model, we observe that at low energies SUSY must be broken which gives mass to the imaginary part of the aether perturbations [27]. The precise value of the mass depends on the SUSY breaking pattern; nevertheless generically one expects the corresponding Compton wavelength to be much shorter than astronomical scales. Then at these scales the imaginary part of the aether is irrelevant and the model reduces to the (linearized) Einstein-aether theory with the parameters[19] (69). The post-Newtonian parameters for the latter theory were derived in [20]; for the choice (69) they reduce to

$$\alpha_1 = 0 \ , \qquad \alpha_2 = -\frac{2C}{2-C} \ . \tag{77}$$

Hence the bound (76) translates into

$$C \lesssim 10^{-7} \qquad\qquad \text{(Solar System)} \ . \tag{78}$$

A more stringent bound

$$|\hat{\alpha}_2| < 1.6 \times 10^{-9} \tag{79}$$

on the analog of the parameter α_2 for strong gravitational field has been obtained in [45] by analyzing the dynamics of solitary pulsars. Strictly speaking, application of this bound to our model requires its non-linear generalization which is beyond the scope of the present work. However, due to the uniqueness of the Einstein-aether theory, this non-linear generalization must reduce to it below the SUSY breaking scale, with the SUSY origin of the theory still

[18] Note that the bound on the graviton velocity following from the absence of gravitational Cherenkov radiation by ultra-high energy cosmic rays [43] is automatically satisfied in our model as it constrains only subluminal graviton velocities.

[19] SUSY breaking can, in principle, introduce deviations from the values (69) in the low-energy theory. However, these deviations are negligible if the SUSY breaking scale lies hierarchically below the scale of Lorentz symmetry breaking set by $M_* = \varkappa^{-1}\sqrt{C}$. We assume that this is the case.

being encoded in the values (69) of the parameters. The relations between the strong- and weak-field parameters in the Einstein-aether theory have been derived in the second reference of [21]. In general, they involve the sensitivities characterizing the change in the binding energies of neutron stars due to their motion with respect to the preferred frame. These depend on the masses of the stars which complicates the translation of the bound (79) into constraints on the model parameters. However, for the choice (69) the sensitivities drop out of the relation between $\hat{\alpha}_2$ and α_2 and one gets simply $\hat{\alpha}_2 = \alpha_2$. This gives the bound,

$$C < 1.6 \times 10^{-9} \qquad \text{(solitary pulsars)} \,. \tag{80}$$

This bound can be viewed as the limit on the energy scale of the Lorentz symmetry violation, $M_* \equiv \varkappa^{-1}\sqrt{C} \lesssim 10^{14}\,\text{GeV}$.

5 Conclusions

We have constructed a supersymmetric extension of the Einstein-aether model — gravitational theory where Lorentz invariance is broken down to the subgroup of spatial rotations by a VEV of a timelike vector field. By restricting to the level of linearized perturbations around the vacuum we have demonstrated that the action of the supersymmetric theory contains a single free dimensionless coupling, in addition to the usual SUGRA parameters. This should be contrasted with the non-supersymmetric Einstein-aether model possessing four arbitrary dimensionless couplings. To find the most general supersymmetric action we used the superfield formalism that makes the global SUSY manifest. The linearized local coordinate and SUSY transformations were implemented as a gauge symmetry acting on the superfields.

We have derived the bosonic part of the Lagrangian in component fields and analyzed the spectrum of the theory. We have shown that, due to breaking of Lorentz invariance, the helicity 2 excitation — graviton — acquires the propagation velocity exceeding the speed of light. We argued that this leads to the extension of the gravitational multiplet by a second — in addition to the usual gravitino — helicity 3/2 state and a helicity 1 state. The latter states enter the theory as parts of the aether superfield. Besides, the theory contains one more pair of helicity ± 1 modes, two helicity 0 modes and two pairs of helicity $\pm 1/2$ modes, all propagating at the speed of light.

At low energies, upon SUSY breaking, the phenomenology of the model reduces to that of the Einstein-aether theory with three out of the four couplings equal to zero. The presence of only one free parameter makes the model highly predictive. The Solar System and pulsar

observations put the most stringent current constraints on this parameter that translate into an upper bound on the energy scale of Lorentz invariance violation $M_* \lesssim 10^{14}\,\text{GeV}$. A future detection of a gravitational wave signal in conjunction with an electromagnetic counterpart is expected to improve this bound by several orders of magnitude.

A natural development of our work will be its generalization to the full non-linear supergravity case. This will open the way to study possible manifestations of the model in cosmology, in particular, the effects of the additional fermionic and bosonic fields present in the model on the dynamics of the early universe. As another direction, it would be interesting to investigate applications of the model to the holographic description of strongly coupled non-relativistic systems.

Similarly to the non-supersymmetric Einstein-aether theory, the model presented in this paper is a valid effective theory below the scale M_*. It is natural to ask what would be the UV completion of the model above the scale M_*, in particular, whether it can be constructed along the lines of [12]. At present we do not have an answer to this question and only note that embedding our model into the Hořava gravity would require overcoming several obstructions discussed in [27]. We leave this study for future.

Acknowledgments We are grateful to Luis Alvarez-Gaume, Oriol Pujolas and Valery Rubakov for discussions. We thank Diego Blas, Mikhail Ivanov and David Pirtskhalava for valuable comments on the draft. A.M. has been supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research. The work of S.S. is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

A Torsion constraints in linearized SUGRA

In this appendix we linearize the constraints on the torsion in superspace and use them to derive the expressions for the superspace connection in terms of the fields of linear non-minimal SUGRA. At the linearized level the torsion tensor is related to the connection and vielbein as follows [35],

$$\begin{aligned} T_{CB}{}^{A} =& T^{(0)\ A}_{CB} + \Phi_{CB}{}^{A} - (-1)^{|B||C|}\Phi_{BC}{}^{A} + D_C I_B{}^{A} - (-1)^{|B||C|} D_B I_C{}^{A} \\ &+ T^{(0)\ D}_{CB} I_D{}^{A} - I_C{}^{D} T^{(0)\ A}_{DB} + (-1)^{|B||C|} I_B{}^{D} T^{(0)\ A}_{DC} \,, \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

where the tensor $I_B{}^{A}$ describing fluctuations of the vielbein has been defined in (26) and $T^{(0)\ A}_{CB}$ is the flat-superspace torsion whose only non-vanishing components are $T^{(0)\ a}_{\gamma\dot\beta} = 2i\sigma^{a}_{\gamma\dot\beta}$. The torsion (81) satisfies the following constraints [35],

$$T_{\gamma\beta}{}^{a} = T^{\dot\gamma\dot\beta a} = T_{\gamma\beta\dot\alpha} = T^{\dot\gamma\dot\beta\alpha} = 0 \,, \tag{82a}$$

$$T_{\gamma\dot\beta}{}^{a} = 2i\sigma^{a}_{\gamma\dot\beta} \,, \tag{82b}$$

$$T_{\gamma}{}^{\dot\beta}{}_{\dot\alpha} = (n-1)\delta^{\dot\beta}_{\dot\alpha}\, T_\gamma \,, \qquad T^{\dot\gamma}{}_{\beta}{}^{\alpha} = (n-1)\delta^{\alpha}_{\beta}\, \bar T^{\dot\gamma} \,, \tag{82c}$$

$$T_{\gamma\beta}{}^{\alpha} = (n+1)(\delta^{\alpha}_{\gamma}\, T_\beta + \delta^{\alpha}_{\beta}\, T_\gamma) \,, \qquad T^{\dot\gamma\dot\beta}{}_{\dot\alpha} = (n+1)(\delta^{\dot\gamma}_{\dot\alpha}\, \bar T^{\dot\beta} + \delta^{\dot\beta}_{\dot\alpha}\, \bar T^{\dot\gamma}) \,, \tag{82d}$$

$$T_{\gamma b}{}^{a} = 2n\delta^{a}_{b}\, T_\gamma \,, \qquad T^{\dot\gamma}{}_{b}{}^{a} = 2n\delta^{a}_{b}\, \bar T^{\dot\gamma} \,, \tag{82e}$$

$$T_{cb}{}^{a} = 0 \,, \tag{82f}$$

where the Bianchi identities imply that the superfield T_γ and its conjugate obey

$$D_\alpha T_\gamma + D_\gamma T_\alpha = 0 \,, \quad \bar D_{\dot\alpha}\bar T_{\dot\gamma} + \bar D_{\dot\gamma}\bar T_{\dot\alpha} = 0 \,. \tag{83}$$

Our strategy is to apply the constraints (82) to the relation (81) and, using the components of $I_B{}^A$ found in Sec. 2.2, derive the equations for the remaining vielbein components and connection.

The first set of constraints (82a) are trivially satisfied by the vielbein (29) and do not provide any further information. Inserting (29) into (82b) we read off the components

$$I_a{}^b = -\delta^{b}_{a}\,\frac{1}{2}(\Gamma' + \bar\Gamma') - \Delta_a H^b \,. \tag{84}$$

From (82c) and (82e) we get respectively

$$(n-1)\delta^{\alpha}_{\beta}\,\bar T_{\dot\gamma} = \Phi_{\dot\gamma\beta}{}^{\alpha} + \bar D_{\dot\gamma} I_\beta{}^{\alpha} + 2i I_{\beta\dot\gamma}{}^{\alpha} \,, \tag{85a}$$

$$2n\delta^{a}_{b}\,\bar T_{\dot\gamma} = \Phi_{\dot\gamma b}{}^{a} + \bar D_{\dot\gamma} I_b{}^{a} - \partial_b I_{\dot\gamma}{}^{a} - i\sigma^{a}_{\delta\dot\gamma}\bar\sigma_{b}^{\dot\beta\beta}\, I_{\beta\dot\beta}{}^{\delta} \,, \tag{85b}$$

where we have introduced $I_{\beta\dot\beta}{}^{\delta} \equiv \sigma^{b}_{\beta\dot\beta} I_b{}^{\delta}$. Let us take the trace of these equations. This eliminates the connection, which is traceless, and one is left with,

$$2(n-1)\,\bar T_{\dot\gamma} = \bar D_{\dot\gamma} I_\beta{}^{\beta} + 2i I_{\beta\dot\gamma}{}^{\beta} \,, \tag{86a}$$

$$8n\,\bar T_{\dot\gamma} = \bar D_{\dot\gamma} I_b{}^{b} - \partial_b I_{\dot\gamma}{}^{b} + 2i I_{\beta\dot\gamma}{}^{\beta} \,. \tag{86b}$$

This system can be solved for the two unknowns $\bar T_{\dot\gamma}$, $I_{\beta\dot\gamma}{}^{\beta}$. Using the expressions (29), (84) we obtain,

$$I_{\beta\dot\gamma}{}^{\beta} = i\bar D_{\dot\gamma}\Gamma + \frac{i}{8}\bar D^2 D^\beta H_{\beta\dot\gamma} \,, \tag{87a}$$

$$\bar T_{\dot\gamma} = \frac{3n+1}{8n}\bar D_{\dot\gamma}\bar\Gamma + \frac{3n-1}{8n}\bar D_{\dot\gamma}\Gamma + \frac{n-1}{32n}\bar D^2 D^\alpha H_{\alpha\dot\gamma} - \frac{n+1}{16n}\bar D_{\dot\gamma} D^\alpha \bar D^{\dot\alpha} H_{\alpha\dot\alpha} \,. \tag{87b}$$

Note that the expression for $\bar T_{\dot\gamma}$ satisfies the condition (83). Next, the constraint (82d) gives,

$$(n+1)(\delta^{\alpha}_{\gamma}\, T_\beta + \delta^{\alpha}_{\beta}\, T_\gamma) = \Phi_{\gamma\beta}{}^{\alpha} + \Phi_{\beta\gamma}{}^{\alpha} + D_\gamma I_\beta{}^{\alpha} + D_\beta I_\gamma{}^{\alpha} \,. \tag{88}$$

This can be solved for the connection $\Phi_{\gamma\beta\alpha}$ using its symmetry in the last two indices; the result is given in Eq. (34a) of the main text. Finally, the constraint (82f) does not provide any additional equations for those components of the vielbein and connection that we are interested in.

To proceed, we consider the covariant derivative of a general scalar superfield,

$$\mathcal{D}_a\Psi = \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma' + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\Gamma}'\right)\partial_a\Psi + \Delta_a H^b \partial_b \Psi - I_a{}^\beta D_\beta \Psi - I_{a\dot{\beta}}\bar{D}^{\dot{\beta}}\Psi \ , \tag{89}$$

where we have used the already known vielbein component (84). Requiring that it transforms as (23c) with the rotation matrix (28) implies the transformation laws

$$\delta I_a{}^\beta = -\frac{1}{4}\partial_a \bar{D}^2 L^\beta \ , \qquad \delta I_{a\dot{\beta}} = -\frac{1}{4}\partial_a D^2 \bar{L}_{\dot{\beta}} \ . \tag{90}$$

These relations fix the form of $I_a{}^\beta$ up to a single constant y,

$$I_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}{}^\beta = \left(\frac{i}{2} + 8y\right)\delta_\alpha^\beta \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\Gamma' + 4y\delta_\alpha^\beta \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\bar{\Gamma}' - \frac{i}{8}\bar{D}^2 D_\alpha H^\beta{}_{\dot{\alpha}} + y\delta_\alpha^\beta \bar{D}^2 D^\gamma H_{\gamma\dot{\alpha}} \ . \tag{91}$$

Taking the trace over α, β and comparing with (87a) one arrives at the expression,

$$I_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}{}^\beta = \frac{i}{2}\delta_\alpha^\beta \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\Gamma - \frac{i}{8}\bar{D}^2 D_\alpha H^\beta{}_{\dot{\alpha}} \ . \tag{92}$$

Finally, substituting this into (85a) we obtain the expression (34b) for the connection $\Phi_{\dot{\gamma}\beta\alpha}$. As a cross-check, the expression for $\Phi_{\dot{\gamma}ba}$ following from (85b) coincides with Eq. (35).

B Calculus in superspace

B.1 Relations between superfield operators

The number of independent operators that can appear in the superfield Lagrangian for linearized SUGRA with broken Lorentz symmetry is reduced by various relations between them arising as a consequence of spinor algebra. The following properties of the superspace differential operators are used in the calculation:
commutators:

$$[\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}, D^2] = 4i\partial_{\gamma\dot{\alpha}}D^\gamma \ , \qquad [\bar{D}^2, D_\beta] = 4i\partial_{\beta\dot{\gamma}}\bar{D}^{\dot{\gamma}} \ , \qquad [\Delta_a, \Delta_b] = 2\epsilon_{abmn}\partial^m\Delta^n \ ; \tag{93}$$

rules for integration by parts:

$$\Psi_1 D^2\Psi_2 \simeq (D^2\Psi_1)\Psi_2 \ , \qquad \Psi_1\bar{D}^2\Psi_2 \simeq (\bar{D}^2\Psi_1)\Psi_2 \ , \qquad \Psi_1\Delta\Psi_2 \simeq (\Delta\Psi_1)\Psi_2 \ , \tag{94}$$

where $\Psi_{1,2}$ are arbitrary superfields and the sign $\simeq$ stands for equality up to a total derivative. Using these relations one derives the identities,

$$\partial_a H^{(b}\Delta_c H^{d)} \simeq 0 \,, \tag{95a}$$

$$\partial_a H^{(b}D^2 H^{d)} \simeq \Delta_a H^{(b}D^2 H^{d)} \simeq \, 0 \,, \tag{95b}$$

$$D^2 H^{(b}\bar{D}^2 H^{d)} \simeq -\,2\,\Delta_m H^b \Delta^m H^d - 6\,\partial_m H^b \partial^m H^d \,, \tag{95c}$$

$$\Delta_{(a}H^b\Delta_{c)}H^d \simeq \partial_{(a}H^b\partial_{c)}H^d + \frac{1}{4}\eta_{ac}(\Delta_m H^b\Delta^m H^d - \partial_m H^b\partial^m H^d) \,, \tag{95d}$$

$$\Delta_a H_k \Delta_c H^k \simeq \partial_a H_k \partial_c H^k + \frac{1}{4}\eta_{ac}(\Delta_m H_k \Delta^m H^k - \partial_m H_k \partial^m H^k) \,, \tag{95e}$$

$$\Delta_a H^k \Delta_k H_b \simeq -\,\Delta_a H_b \Delta_k H^k + 2\partial_a H_b \partial_k H^k + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_m H_a \Delta^m H_b - \partial_m H_a \partial^m H_b) \,, \tag{95f}$$

$$\Delta_a H^{[c}\Delta_b H^{d]} \simeq -\,\epsilon_{abmn}\partial_m H^{[c}\Delta_n H^{d]} \,, \tag{95g}$$

$$\Delta_{[a}H^c\Delta_{b]}H^d \simeq -\,\epsilon_{abmn}\partial_m H^c \Delta_n H^d \,, \tag{95h}$$

$$\epsilon_{amnk}\partial^m H_b \Delta^n H^k \simeq -\,\Delta_a H_b \Delta_k H^k + \partial_a H_b \partial_k H^k + \frac{1}{4}(\Delta_m H_a \Delta^m H^b - \partial_m H_a \partial^m H_b) \tag{95i}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_{amnk}\partial_b H^m \Delta^n H^k \simeq &-\,\epsilon_{amnk}\Delta_b H^m \partial^n H^k - 2\Delta_a H_b \Delta_k H^k + 2\partial_a H_b \partial_k H^k \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_k H_a \Delta^k H_b - \partial_k H_a \partial^k H_b) \\ &+ \eta_{ab}\left((\Delta_k H^k)^2 - (\partial_k H^k)^2 - \frac{1}{4}\Delta_m H_k \Delta^m H^k + \frac{1}{4}\partial_m H_k \partial^m H^k\right) .\end{aligned} \tag{95j}$$

Here the round (square) brackets denote symmetrization (antisymmetrization) over the corresponding indices.

B.2 Transformations of the superfield operators

In this Appendix we list the gauge variations of various superfield operators that can potentially enter into the quadratic Lagrangian. We expand the variations as linear combinations of independent contributions. For the CP-even sector the coefficients of this expansion are listed in Table 1 and for the CP-odd sector in Table 2. Each column in the tables corresponds to a given operator and rows to the terms in the expansion of its variation. The notations for the rows are,

$$\mathcal{O}_1 = L_\beta w^a w^b \bar{\sigma}_a^{\dot{\beta}\beta}\bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}}\partial_b\partial_k H^k \,, \tag{96a}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_2 = L_\beta w^a w^b \bar{\sigma}_k^{\dot{\beta}\beta}\bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}}\partial^k\partial_a H_b \,, \tag{96b}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_3 = L_\beta w^a w^b \bar{\sigma}_k^{\dot{\beta}\beta}\bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}}\partial_a\partial_b H^k \,, \tag{96c}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_4 = L_\beta w^a w^b \bar{\sigma}_a^{\dot{\beta}\beta} \bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}} \Box H_b \ , \tag{96d}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_5 = L_\beta w^a w^b (\sigma_{ak})_\gamma{}^\beta \bar{D}^2 D^\gamma \partial_b H^k \ , \tag{96e}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_6 = L_\beta w^a w^b (\sigma_{ak})_\gamma{}^\beta \bar{D}^2 D^\gamma \partial^k H_b \ , \tag{96f}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_7 = L_\beta w^a w^b \bar{D}^2 D^\beta \partial_a H_b \ , \tag{96g}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_8 = L_\beta w^a w^b \epsilon_{aklm} \bar{\sigma}^{k\dot{\beta}\beta} \bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}} \partial_b \partial^l H^m \ , \tag{96h}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_9 = L_\beta w^a w^b \bar{\sigma}_a^{\dot{\beta}\beta} \bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}} \partial_b \Gamma \ , \tag{96i}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{10} = L_\beta w^a w^b \bar{\sigma}_a^{\dot{\beta}\beta} \bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}} \partial_b \bar{\Gamma} \ , \tag{96j}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{11} = L_\beta (\sigma_{kl})_\gamma{}^\beta \bar{D}^2 D^\gamma \partial^k H^l \ , \tag{96k}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{12} = L_\beta \bar{\sigma}_k^{\dot{\beta}\beta} \bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}} \partial^k \partial_l H^l \ , \tag{96l}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{13} = L_\beta \bar{\sigma}_k^{\dot{\beta}\beta} \bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}} \Box H^k \ , \tag{96m}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{14} = L_\beta \bar{D}^2 D^\beta \partial_k H^k \ , \tag{96n}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{15} = L_\beta \bar{\sigma}_k^{\dot{\beta}\beta} \bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}} \partial^k \Gamma \ , \tag{96o}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{16} = L_\beta \bar{\sigma}_k^{\dot{\beta}\beta} \bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}} \partial^k \bar{\Gamma} \ , \tag{96p}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{17} = L_\beta \bar{D}^2 D^\beta \bar{\Gamma} \ . \tag{96q}$$

We focus only on the part of the variations proportional to L_β; the terms with $\bar{L}_{\dot{\beta}}$ are obtained by complex conjugation. For example, from the second column of Table 1 one reads,

$$\delta(w^a w^b \partial_a H_b \partial_c H^c) \simeq \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{O}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{O}_2 + \text{h.c.} \ ,$$

where $\simeq$ stands, as usual, for 'equal up to a total derivative'.

A linear combination of operators with a vector of coefficients X solves the system of equations,

$$\mathcal{M} \cdot X = 0 \ , \tag{97}$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is the matrix of Table 1 (2) for the CP-even (odd) sector respectively. In the case of CP-even operators a non-trivial solution of this system exists and is parameterized by two free variables. The corresponding invariant action is presented in the main text. For the CP-odd case Eq. (97) has only a trivial solution, $X = 0$.

	$\delta(V_a\bar{V}^a)$	$\delta(w^a w^b \partial_a H_b \partial_c H^c)$	$\delta(w^a w^b \partial_a H_c \partial_b H^c)$	$\delta(w^a w^b \partial_c H_a \partial^c H_b)$	$\delta(w^a w^b \Delta_a H_b \Delta_c H^c)$	$\delta(w^a w^b \Delta_c H_a \Delta^c H_b)$	$\delta(w^a w^b \epsilon_{acde} \partial^c H^d \Delta_b H^e)$	$\delta\big(i w^a w^b \partial_a H_b (\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma})\big)$	$\delta\big(w^a w^b \Delta_a H_b (\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma})\big)$	$\delta\big((\partial_a H^a)^2\big)$	$\delta(\partial_a H_b \partial^a H^b)$	$\delta\big((\Delta_a H^a)^2\big)$	$\delta\big(\Delta_a H_b \Delta^a H^b\big)$	$\delta\big(i \partial_a H^a (\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma})\big)$	$\delta\big(\Delta_a H^a (\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma})\big)$	$\delta(\Gamma^2 + \bar{\Gamma}^2)$	$\delta(\Gamma\bar{\Gamma})$
$\mathcal{O}_1$		$\frac{1}{2}$			$\frac{1}{2}$												
$\mathcal{O}_2$		$\frac{1}{2}$			$\frac{1}{2}$			$\frac{n+1}{3n+1}$	$-\frac{n+1}{3n+1}$								
$\mathcal{O}_3$			1														
$\mathcal{O}_4$				1		1											
$\mathcal{O}_5$					$-\frac{i}{4}$		$-\frac{i}{2}$										
$\mathcal{O}_6$	$-\frac{i}{2}$				$-\frac{3i}{4}$	$-2i$	$\frac{i}{2}$		$\frac{i}{2}$								
$\mathcal{O}_7$	$-\frac{i}{4}$				$-\frac{i}{4}$	$-i$		$\frac{in}{2(3n+1)}$	$\frac{i(n+1)}{4(3n+1)}$								
$\mathcal{O}_8$							i										
$\mathcal{O}_9$	$-i$							$\frac{i}{2}$	$\frac{i}{2}$								
$\mathcal{O}_{10}$								$-\frac{i}{2}$	$\frac{i}{2}$								
$\mathcal{O}_{11}$					$-\frac{i}{4}$		$-\frac{i}{2}$					$\frac{3i}{2}$	$2i$		$-\frac{i}{2}$		
$\mathcal{O}_{12}$										1		1		$\frac{n+1}{3n+1}$	$-\frac{n+1}{3n+1}$		
$\mathcal{O}_{13}$											1		1				
$\mathcal{O}_{14}$	$\frac{i}{8}$											$-\frac{i}{4}$	$-i$	$\frac{in}{2(3n+1)}$	$\frac{i(n+1)}{4(3n+1)}$		
$\mathcal{O}_{15}$	$-\frac{i}{4}$								$\frac{i}{2}$					$\frac{i}{2}$	$-\frac{3i}{2}$		i
$\mathcal{O}_{16}$														$-\frac{i}{2}$	$\frac{i}{2}$		$-\frac{i(n+1)}{3n+1}$
$\mathcal{O}_{17}$	$\frac{3}{16}$								$-\frac{1}{8}$						$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{n+1}{4(3n+1)}$

Table 1: The coefficients in the gauge variations of CP-even operators. Only non-zero entries are shown.

	$\delta\big(w^a w^b \partial_a H_b \Delta_c H^c\big)$	$\delta\big(w^a w^b \partial_c H^c \Delta_a H_b\big)$	$\delta\big(w^a w^b \partial_a H_b (\Gamma+\bar\Gamma)\big)$	$\delta\big(i w^a w^b \Delta_a H_b (\Gamma-\bar\Gamma)\big)$	$\delta(\partial_a H^a \Delta_b H^b)$	$\delta\big(\partial_a H^a (\Gamma+\bar\Gamma)\big)$	$\delta\big(i\Delta_a H^a (\Gamma-\bar\Gamma)\big)$	$\delta\big(i(\Gamma^2-\bar\Gamma^2)\big)$
$\mathcal{O}_1$	$-\frac{i}{2}$	$\frac{i}{2}$						
$\mathcal{O}_2$	$\frac{i}{2}$	$-\frac{i}{2}$	$-\frac{i(n+1)}{3n+1}$	$-\frac{i(n+1)}{3n+1}$				
$\mathcal{O}_5$	$-\frac{1}{4}$							
$\mathcal{O}_6$		$\frac{1}{4}$		$\frac{1}{2}$				
$\mathcal{O}_7$	$\frac{3}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{2n+1}{2(3n+1)}$	$-\frac{n+1}{4(3n+1)}$				
$\mathcal{O}_9$			$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$				
$\mathcal{O}_{10}$			$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$				
$\mathcal{O}_{11}$					$-\frac{1}{4}$		$-\frac{1}{2}$	
$\mathcal{O}_{12}$						$-\frac{i(n+1)}{3n+1}$	$-\frac{i(n+1)}{3n+1}$	
$\mathcal{O}_{14}$		$-\frac{1}{8}$			$\frac{3}{8}$	$-\frac{2n+1}{2(3n+1)}$	$-\frac{n+1}{4(3n+1)}$	
$\mathcal{O}_{15}$				$-\frac{1}{2}$		$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2}$	
$\mathcal{O}_{16}$						$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	
$\mathcal{O}_{17}$				$\frac{i}{8}$			$-\frac{i}{2}$	$\frac{i}{2}$

Table 2: Same as Table 1, but for the CP-odd operators.

C Helicity 1 modes

Here we analyze in detail the sector of modes with helicities ± 1 described by the Lagrangian (68). We work in the frame where the aether VEV has vanishing spatial components, see Eq. (36). In this frame the time-components of aether perturbations vanish due to the constraint (38), $\hat{v}_0^{R,I} = 0$. The metric perturbations are taken in the form

$$h_{00} = 0 \ , \qquad h_{0i} = n_i \ , \qquad h_{ij} = \partial_i \xi_j + \partial_j \xi_i \ , \qquad\qquad i = 1,2,3 \ ,$$

with all vectors being transverse,

$$\partial_i n_i = \partial_i \xi_i = \partial_i \hat{v}_i^R = \partial_i \hat{v}_i^I = 0 \ .$$

The Lagrangian (68) in this sector reads,

$$\mathcal{L}_{h=\pm1} = \frac{1}{2\varkappa^2}\Bigg[-\frac{1}{2}n_i\Delta n_i + \frac{1}{2}\xi_i\Delta\ddot{\xi}_i - \dot{n}_i\Delta\xi_i - \hat{v}_i^R\ddot{\hat{v}}_i^R + \hat{v}_i^R\Delta\hat{v}_i^R \\ - \left(1-\frac{C}{2}\right)\hat{v}_i^I\ddot{\hat{v}}_i^I + \hat{v}_i^I\Delta\hat{v}_i^I - \sqrt{C}\hat{v}_i^R\ddot{n}_i + \sqrt{C}\hat{v}_i^R\Delta\dot{\xi}_i + C\epsilon_{ijk}\,\hat{v}_i^R\partial_j\dot{\hat{v}}_k^I\Bigg] , \tag{98}$$

where, with some abuse of notations, we use Δ to denote the spatial Laplacian, $\Delta = \partial_i\partial_i$; as we are not going to use the operator (12) in this Appendix, this should not lead to confusion. In deriving the expression (98) we kept only the leading-order terms in the gravitational part of the Lagrangian: the omitted corrections affect the dynamics of helicity 1 modes only at order $O(C^{3/2})$ or higher. Note a peculiar mixing term between the real and imaginary parts of the aether perturbations.

Varying (98) with respect to ξ_i and setting the gauge $\xi_i = 0$ afterwards one finds,

$$n_i = -\sqrt{C}\,\hat{v}_i^R \tag{99}$$

up to corrections of order[20] $O(C^{3/2})$. Substituting this into the equations for the aether perturbations we obtain,

$$-\left(1-\frac{C}{2}\right)\ddot{\hat{v}}_i^R + \Delta\hat{v}_i^R + \frac{C}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}\partial_j\dot{\hat{v}}_k^I = 0 , \tag{101a}$$

$$-\left(1-\frac{C}{2}\right)\ddot{\hat{v}}_i^I + \Delta\hat{v}_i^I - \frac{C}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}\partial_j\dot{\hat{v}}_k^R = 0 . \tag{101b}$$

To solve this system, we take $\hat{v}_i^{R,I}$ as a sum of circularly polarized plane waves with energy E and momentum $\mathbf{p}$,

$$\hat{v}_i^{R,I} = \left(e_i^{(+)}f_+^{R,I} + e_i^{(-)}f_-^{R,I}\right)\mathrm{e}^{-iEt+i\mathbf{px}} ,$$

where

$$e_i^{(\pm)} = e_i^{(1)} \pm i\,e_i^{(2)} ,$$

and the unit vectors $\mathbf{e}^{(1)}$, $\mathbf{e}^{(2)}$ form together with $\mathbf{p}/p$ a right-handed triad. Substituting these expressions into Eqs. (101) and diagonalizing the resulting eigenvalue matrix we find the dispersion relations for the modes:

[20]The variation of (98) with respect to n_i yields the equation

$$\Delta n_i + \sqrt{C}\,\ddot{\hat{v}}_i^R = 0 . \tag{100}$$

By combining this with (99) one could naively conclude that the velocity of the excitations described by $\hat{v}_i^R$ is equal to 1. This is true only at the zeroth order in C: equations (99), (100) are valid only up to $O(C^{3/2})$ corrections and hence do not allow to capture the $O(C)$ terms in the velocity, which we are interested in.

i) modes with $f^I_\pm = \pm i f^R_\pm \quad \Longrightarrow \quad E^2 = p^2$

ii) modes with $f^I_\pm = \mp i f^R_\pm \quad \Longrightarrow \quad E^2 = (1+C)\, p^2$

In the latter case the dispersion relation coincides with that of gravitons, see Eq. (71), which identifies the corresponding modes as members of the gravitational supermultiplet according to the discussion in Sec. 4. Note that these modes are an essential mixture of real and imaginary aether components with the admixture of metric perturbations, see Eq. (99).

Finally, let us comment on the consequences of SUSY breaking. As discussed in [27], it leads to the generation of mass for the imaginary part of the aether $\hat{v}^I_i$. Then the dispersion relation for the remaining component $\hat{v}^R_i$ is obtained from (101a) by simply dropping off the last term, which yields $E^2 = (1 + C/2)\, p^2$. We conclude that the SUSY breaking modifies the velocity of the helicity 1 modes, so that its deviation from unity is twice smaller than that for gravitons. This coincides with the result in the Einstein-aether model [40] for the choice of parameters (69).

References

[1] R. Gregory, V. A. Rubakov and S. M. Sibiryakov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5928 (2000) [hep-th/0002072].

[2] G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and M. Porrati, Phys. Lett. B **485**, 208 (2000) [hep-th/0005016].

[3] N. Arkani-Hamed, H. C. Cheng, M. A. Luty and S. Mukohyama, JHEP **0405**, 074 (2004) [hep-th/0312099].

[4] S. L. Dubovsky, JHEP **0410**, 076 (2004) [hep-th/0409124].

[5] V. A. Rubakov and P. G. Tinyakov, Phys. Usp. **51**, 759 (2008) [arXiv:0802.4379 [hep-th]].

[6] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi and E. Trincherini, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 064036 (2009) [arXiv:0811.2197 [hep-th]].

[7] C. Deffayet, O. Pujolas, I. Sawicki and A. Vikman, JCAP **1010**, 026 (2010) [arXiv:1008.0048 [hep-th]].

[8] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze and A. J. Tolley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 231101 (2011) [arXiv:1011.1232 [hep-th]].

[9] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, Phys. Rept. **513**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1106.2476 [astro-ph.CO]].

[10] D. Mattingly, Living Rev. Rel. **8**, 5 (2005) [gr-qc/0502097].

[11] S. Liberati, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 133001 (2013) [arXiv:1304.5795 [gr-qc]].

[12] P. Horava, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 084008 (2009) [arXiv:0901.3775 [hep-th]].

[13] A. O. Barvinsky, D. Blas, M. Herrero-Valea, S. M. Sibiryakov and C. F. Steinwachs, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 6, 064022 (2016) [arXiv:1512.02250 [hep-th]].

[14] D. Blas, O. Pujolas and S. Sibiryakov, JHEP **0910**, 029 (2009) [arXiv:0906.3046 [hep-th]]; Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 181302 (2010) [arXiv:0909.3525 [hep-th]].

[15] T. Jacobson, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 101502 (2010) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **82**, 129901 (2010)] [arXiv:1001.4823 [hep-th]], Phys. Rev. D **89**, 081501 (2014) [arXiv:1310.5115 [gr-qc]].

[16] D. Blas, O. Pujolas and S. Sibiryakov, JHEP **1104**, 018 (2011) [arXiv:1007.3503 [hep-th]].

[17] T. Jacobson and D. Mattingly, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 024028 (2001) [gr-qc/0007031].

[18] T. Jacobson, "Einstein-aether gravity: A Status report," PoS QG **-PH**, 020 (2007) [arXiv:0801.1547 [gr-qc]].

[19] S. M. Carroll and E. A. Lim, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 123525 (2004) [hep-th/0407149].

[20] B. Z. Foster and T. Jacobson, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 064015 (2006) [gr-qc/0509083].

[21] K. Yagi, D. Blas, N. Yunes and E. Barausse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, no. 16, 161101 (2014) [arXiv:1307.6219 [gr-qc]]; Phys. Rev. D **89**, no. 8, 084067 (2014) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 6, 069902 (2014)] Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 6, 069901 (2014)] [arXiv:1311.7144 [gr-qc]].

[22] B. Audren, D. Blas, M. M. Ivanov, J. Lesgourgues and S. Sibiryakov, JCAP **1503**, no. 03, 016 (2015) [arXiv:1410.6514 [astro-ph.CO]].

[23] D. Blas and E. Lim, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **23**, 1443009 (2015) [arXiv:1412.4828 [gr-qc]].

[24] S. Janiszewski and A. Karch, JHEP **1302**, 123 (2013) [arXiv:1211.0005 [hep-th]], Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, no. 8, 081601 (2013) [arXiv:1211.0010 [hep-th]].

[25] T. Griffin, P. Hořava and C. M. Melby-Thompson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, no. 8, 081602 (2013) [arXiv:1211.4872 [hep-th]].

[26] S. Groot Nibbelink and M. Pospelov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 081601 (2005) [hep-ph/0404271]; P. A. Bolokhov, S. Groot Nibbelink and M. Pospelov, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 015013 (2005) [hep-ph/0505029].

[27] O. Pujolas and S. Sibiryakov, JHEP **1201**, 062 (2012) [arXiv:1109.4495 [hep-th]].

[28] V. A. Kostelecky and N. Russell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 11 (2011) [arXiv:0801.0287 [hep-ph]].

[29] J. Wess, J. Bagger, "Supersymmetry and Supergravity," *Princeton Univ. Press (1983).*

[30] D. Baumann and D. Green, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 103520 (2012) [arXiv:1109.0292 [hep-th]].

[31] L. V. Delacretaz, V. Gorbenko and L. Senatore, "The Supersymmetric Effective Field Theory of Inflation," arXiv:1610.04227 [hep-th].

[32] P. Breitenlohner, Phys. Lett. B **67**, 49 (1977), Nucl. Phys. B **124**, 500 (1977).

[33] W. Siegel and S. J. Gates, Jr., Nucl. Phys. B **147**, 77 (1979).

[34] M. Brown and S. J. Gates, Jr., Nucl. Phys. B **165**, 445 (1980).

[35] G. Girardi, R. Grimm, M. Muller and J. Wess, Z. Phys. C **26**, 123 (1984).

[36] A. Marakulin and S. Sibiryakov, *in preparation.*

[37] S. J. Gates, M. T. Grisaru, M. Rocek and W. Siegel, "Superspace Or One Thousand and One Lessons in Supersymmetry," Front. Phys. **58**, 1 (1983) [hep-th/0108200].

[38] I. L. Buchbinder and S. M. Kuzenko, "Ideas and Methods of Supersymmetry and Supergravity: A Walk Through Superspace," *Institute of Physics Pub. (1998).*

[39] W. D. Linch, III, M. A. Luty and J. Phillips, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 025008 (2003) [hep-th/0209060].

[40] T. Jacobson and D. Mattingly, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 024003 (2004) [gr-qc/0402005].

[41] J. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos and D. V. Nanopoulos, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **31**, 1650155 (2016) [arXiv:1602.04764 [gr-qc]].

[42] D. Blas, M. M. Ivanov, I. Sawicki and S. Sibiryakov, Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **103**, no. 10, 708 (2016) [JETP Lett. **103**, no. 10, 624 (2016)] [arXiv:1602.04188 [gr-qc]].

[43] G. D. Moore and A. E. Nelson, JHEP **0109**, 023 (2001) [hep-ph/0106220].

[44] C. M. Will, Living Rev. Rel. **9**, 3 (2006) [gr-qc/0510072].

[45] L. Shao, R. N. Caballero, M. Kramer, N. Wex, D. J. Champion and A. Jessner, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 165019 (2013) [arXiv:1307.2552 [gr-qc]].